REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the first Office Action mailed February 12, 2004. Claims 1-13 were examined in the Office Action and all have been rejected. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. New claims 14-20 have been added. No claims have been canceled. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1 and 11 are amended herein to more distinctly point out the nature of the resources. Claims 1 and 11 now distinctly claim that the property sheet includes at least one property page from a software resource and at least on property page originating from a hardware resource. Discussion of such hardware and software resources can be found in paragraph [0035] among other places in the written description.

New claims 14-20 are added herein. Support for the new claims may be found in paragraphs [0063] to [0083]. New claims 14-20 are believed to be patentably distinguished over the cited prior art made of reference as they are directed to a method of installing a new hardware or software resource on a distributed network.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed at non-statutory subject matter because, in the Examiner's words, they are "purely descriptive material." Claim 11 is amended herein to more distinctly describe the claimed invention. Applicants point out that claims to computer readable media comprising computer readable instructions and data structures are statutory subject matter under *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPOQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (claim to data structure stored on a computer readable medium and that increases computer efficiency held statutory subject matter).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duxbury (USPN 6,684,227) in view of Wilson (USPN 6,002,398).

8

In order to establish *prima facie* obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), three basic criteria must be met, namely: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation to combine the references or modify the reference teaching; (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) the reference or references when combined must teach or suggest each claim limitation (Manual of Patent Examining Procedure 2142). Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the reference fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of the pending claims.

Specifically, Applicants assert that neither Duxbury nor Wilson, alone or in combination, disclose a network having a plurality of resources including hardware and software resources as now claimed. Applicants further assert that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose "receiving two or more schema documents" from a first software resource and a second hardware resource.

Duxbury is directed to "a method and apparatus for storing and accessing electronic content." Duxbury, Col. 1, lines 6-7. Duxbury, ultimately, is only concerned with managing and displaying objects of content that are related only is as much as the viewer is interested in them, and is not directed at single point management of different resources related to an object on a distributed network. As a document management system, Duxbury does not disclose or suggest that his method is suitable in managing disparate hardware and software computer resources as now described in the Applicants' claims. Under Applicants' definitions, Duxbury is directed at displaying multiple content objects (which are not even resources) maintained by a single software resource. As Duxbury has only one resource, it does not teach or suggest receiving property pages from different resources in a distributed network.

Wilson is directed to displaying a tabbed dialogue box in which property pages may be added to a property sheet to allow properties or attributes of an external object to be easily modified. However, as the Examiner noted Wilson does not disclose or suggest receiving property pages from different resources in a distributed network.

Brown (USPN 6,501,491 commonly assigned) is directed to "a common data access user interface" or a directory service for accessing and viewing objects maintained on network resources. Brown does not disclose or suggest, however, modifying the objects maintained on the network resources. In fact, Brown teaches away from modifying the objects on each of the resources. See Brown, Col. 1, line 56 to Col. 2, line 7. Brown teaches a two-database directory

9

system that includes "[directory] objects that have **information about resources** available on the network" (Brown, Col. 4, lines 10-12, emphasis added) and "display specifiers" which "provide display instructions information [for displaying the directory objects]" (Brown, Col. 4, lines 18-19). Brown teaches that when a change occurs in the network, the display specifiers are modified rather than modifying either the objects on the resources or the directory objects. Brown, Col. 4, lines 18-28.

Cragun (USPN 6,359,634) is directed to extending a graphical user interface (GUI). Cragun, Abstract. In Cragun, tabs may be added to a preexisting application GUI having tabs. Identifiers of added third party pages are added to a registry along with information about which tabbed dialog or property sheet each added page is to be attached and which pocket of space between existing property page tabs where each added page is to be located. Each page within a tabbed dialog is processed, adding hard coded tabs, and checking for third party pages at each defined open position or page pocket. Cragun does not disclose using XML schema to define property sheets that represent objects, much less objects that are maintained by resources on a distributed network.

Applicants' invention differs from that of the prior art made of record, including Duxbury and Brown, considerably. Applicants' resources refer to hardware and software resources of the distributed network, not just a content resource as disclosed by Duxbury. Duxbury is not concerned with the addition of new resources to the distributed network and how that may affect the objects stored on other resources. Furthermore, opposite to the teaching of Brown, the installation of a new resource may result in the modification of an object maintained by another resource (via the addition of a property page provided by the new resource to the property sheet representing the object maintained by the other resource).

Independent Claim 1

The Examiner cites Duxbury "FIG. 1 and corresponding text" as disclosing a distributed network environment having a server and a plurality of managed resources, each resource maintaining a plurality of objects. Applicants submit that Duxbury discloses a distributed network of clients, and a webserver having only one resource that maintains a plurality of objects, the content store 13. The content store "holds all the content for the website" and includes a plurality of objects wherein "[e]ach object represents either an actual item of

content..., or a folder which may contain other objects." Duxbury, Col. 2, lines 33-37.
Applicants draw the Examiner's attention to FIG. 1, which clearly shows the content store 13 as
a single software resource, i.e., a database, within the webserver 10.

Applicants submit that Duxbury does not disclose or suggest a plurality of resources
including hardware and software resources as now claimed in claim 1. Applicants respectfully
request the Examiner compare Duxbury's FIG. 1 showing one content store with Applicants'
FIG. 1 showing multiple separate and distinct resources 110, 112, 114. Applicants also point
out that in the corresponding section in the specification, the resources 110, 112, and 114 are
described as hardware resources ("The resources 108, may include hardware devices, such as
printers, workstations, servers, etc.") and software resources ("software related elements such as
databases, security systems, email accounts and user accounts, among others"). See paragraph
[0035].

Examiner also cites Duxbury's "Tabs" as suggesting receiving property pages from
different resources. The Applicants respectfully disagree. All content displayed by the "tabs"
are stored on and originated from the only resource in Duxbury – the content store 13.

The above-mentioned elements missing from Duxbury are not found in Wilson. Wilson
is directed to a general method of use of property sheets and does not address any specific
applications of property sheets. The management of objects maintained on resources in a
distributed network.

While the Applicants agree that Duxbury could be combined with Wilson, such a
combination would yield a property sheet template providing access to content objects on a
single content store resource. There is no suggestion that such a combination would yield a
method for managing objects on hardware and software resources in a distributed network as
described by Applicants.

Nor can the Examiner find the missing elements in Brown. As discussed above, while
Brown discloses modifying his display specifiers in response to the installation of a new
resource, Brown specifically teaches away from modifying objects stored on any resources.

Independent Claim 11

Applicant herein amends claim 11 to include a property sheet representing an object
maintained by a resource, a first property page associated with a <u>software</u> resource and a second

11

property page associated with a <u>hardware</u> resource. Via these pages, a user may manage the relationship of the object to the resources that provide the pages. For example, an administrator may access a user object and change printer resource settings on a page provided by the printer hardware resource, change password information on a page provided by a security software resource, etc. making it unnecessary to access multiple resources independently through the resource-specific interfaces. As described above, neither Duxbury nor Wilson alone or in combination disclose multiple resources and certainly do not teach or suggest property pages originating from software and hardware resources. Therefore, there can be no suggestion or teaching of a property sheet representing an object maintained by a resource, a first property page and second property page as claimed.

Applicants believe that claims 1 and 11, as amended, are distinguishable over Duxbury and Wilson. Therefore, Applicants believe claims 1 and 11, and all claims dependent on claim 1 and 11 – claims 2-10 and 12-13, are in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his rejection and find claim 1-13 allowable.

New Claims 14-20

New claims 14-20 are directed to a method of installing a new resource on a distributed network. Applicants' believe that none of the cited references made of record anticipate or suggest the new claims.

Conclusion

As originally filed, the present application included 13 claims, 2 of which were independent. As amended, the present application now includes 20 claims, 3 of which are independent. Accordingly, it is believed that no further fees are due with this Amendment. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

In light of the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. Should any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attempt to resolve those issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/10/04

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

George C. Lewis, #53,214
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
303.357.1639